



Alan C. Lloyd, Ph.D.  
Agency Secretary  
Cal/EPA



## Department of Toxic Substances Control

700 Heinz Avenue, Suite 200  
Berkeley, California 94710-2721

SFUND RECORDS CTR  
2227423



Arnold Schwarzenegger  
Governor

March 27, 2006

Commanding Officer  
Department of the Navy  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
Southwest Division  
1455 Frazee Road  
San Diego, CA 92108  
Attention: Keith Forman

REVISED FINAL, BASEWIDE RADIOLOGICAL REMOVAL ACTION, ACTION  
MEMORANDUM, HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA,  
DATED FEBRUARY 14, 2006

Dear Mr. Forman:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Revised Final Basewide Radiological Removal Action, Action Memorandum for Hunters Point Shipyard. Comments of the Department of Toxic Substances Control are provided below. The comments of the California Department of Health Services are attached.

### DTSC Comments

1. Section I. Purpose, page 1 and Section III. Threats to Public Health, Welfare, or the Environment and Statutory and Regulatory Authorities, Page 9. While DTSC agrees that interim actions are often appropriate for the removal of radiological contamination at Hunters Point, DTSC continues to disagree with the Navy on the application of Time Critical Removal Actions. Please explain how the planned removal actions meet the requirements of Code of Federal Regulations Section 300.415(b)(4).
2. Section II, C, 2. Potential for Continued State or Local Response, page 9. DTSC does not defer to US EPA for the development of cleanup goals for radiological removal actions. The remediation of radiological contaminated sites at Hunters Point must meet the requirement of CERCLA and Chapter 6.8 of California Health and Safety Code. This includes the evaluation of risks from sites in a report such as a Remedial Investigation Report, the evaluation of remedial

Mr. Keith Forman  
March 27, 2006  
Page 2

alternatives in a Feasibility Study and a final selection of a remedial action, or no further action in a Record of Decision. The DTSC must concur with the Record of Decision, which will include the selection of a final remedy for radiological sites. Please elaborate on the extended role of DTSC and the other regulatory agencies in remedial decisions involving radiological sites being remediated under CERCLA at Hunters Point.

3. Section V.A.3, Contribution to Remedial Performance, page 12. This section states that the Navy intention is that the removal actions are the final radiological remedy for each site. Please add that the each radiological site cleanup will be later evaluated to determine if the level of cleanup achieved is appropriate for a final remedy or if additional remediation is necessary.

If you have any questions regarding this letter please call me at 510-540-3776.

Sincerely,



Thomas P. Lanphar  
Senior Hazardous Substance Scientist  
Office of Military Facilities

cc: Mr. Michael Work  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Region IX  
75 Hawthorne Street  
San Francisco, California 94105-3901

Mr. James Ricks  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Region IX  
75 Hawthorne Street  
San Francisco, California 94105-3901Mr.

Mr. James Ponton  
Regional Water Quality Control Board  
San Francisco Bay Region  
1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400  
Oakland, California 94612

Mr. Keith Forman  
March 27, 2006  
Page 3

Ms. Deirdre Dement  
Department of Health Services  
Environmental Management Branch  
P.O. Box 997413, MS 7405  
Sacramento, California 95899-7413

cc: VIA EMAIL  
Ms. Amy Brownell  
City of San Francisco

Ms. Karla Brasaemle  
Tech Law, Inc.

Julia Vetromile  
Tetra Tech EMI

Dr. Ray Tompkins  
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB)

Barbara Bushnell  
RAB Community Co-chair

## California Department of Health Services (CDHS) Review

Activity: Review of Navy's February 2006 *Revised Final Basewide Radiological Removal Action, Action Memorandum*, Hunters Point Shipyard, San Francisco, California

March 24, 2006

Page 1 of 1

---

### General Comments:

1. Similar comments have been submitted previously in other reviews of the Navy's documents.

### Specific Comments:

1. Page 5, Section II.B.1.4, Phase IV: Using criteria for a "free release, for industrial use," will not guarantee a release for unrestricted use from the State of California. (See Specific Comment 2.)
2. Page 6, Section II.B.1.5.3: If the Navy is requesting an unrestricted release from the State of California, the "site release criteria" will need to show that removal actions cleaned the site to as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA.) Any averaged residual contamination concentrations when modeled should not exceed a dose of 25 millirem per year (mrem/year). The "Table 1, Release Criteria" will need to reflect these values.
3. Page 9, Section II.C.2.0: As stated numerous times, the CDHS does not defer to the U.S. EPA with regard to unrestricted release requirements. Our dose assessment will be based on ALARA and residual contamination. The averaged residual contamination data used for your dose model should reflect representative sampling of the site.